



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,239	08/26/2003	Tadao Takami	241972US8	1755
22850	7590	06/25/2007		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER PARK, JEONG S	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/647,239		TAKAMI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jeong S. Park		2154	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/19/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to communications filed April 19, 2007.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul et al. (hereinafter Paul)(U.S. Patent No. 6,052,709) in view of He (Pub. No. US 2003/0182383 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Paul discloses as follows:

A mobile communication terminal, wherein a mobile communication terminal is interpreted as a user terminal (user terminal, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 46-48, reference character 130-132 in Figure 5) comprising;

A mail receiving means for receiving mail (an email storage database, reference character 206 in Figure 2, which receives and stores incoming email, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 26-29);

A detection conditions acquisition means for acquiring detection conditions data including a letter string (a spam probe, an email address which is a letter string, created by processor to identify sources of unsolicited email or spam, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 19-24) from a detection conditions distribution server (control center, see, e.g., reference character 101 in Figure 1, col. 5, lines 54-56) and storing the detection

Art Unit: 2154

condition data in a detection conditions storage means (exclusion list manager, see, e.g., 202 in Figure 2, col. 5, lines 63-67)(alert signals received from the control center are automatically processed by the filtering application so that the source data extracted from the alert signals are automatically added to the stored exclusion list, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 17-25);

A detection means for performing detection processing for extracting the mail received by the mail receiving means (email storage, 206 in Figure 2) when a condition, in which the mail includes a letter string conforming to the letter string included in the detection condition data stored in the detection conditions storage means (exclusion list manager, 202 in Figure 2), is satisfied (filtering application, 200 in Figure 2, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 54-62); and

All detected mails are stored at a special folder in the user's in-box (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-8).

Paul does not disclose for sending the detected mail information to the detected mail notification receiving server.

He discloses as follows:

Detected mail notification processing (a web-server based email message filter and notification system) means for sending information (message passes the criteria set by the user, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0031], lines 9-13) that the mail has been extracted by the detection means (email detection means, 6 in figure 1) to a detected mail notification receiving server (notification receiver, 11 in figure 1 and email server in figure 5, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0040], lines 1-6)(a web-server based email

Art Unit: 2154

message filter and notification system sends a notification data signal to the email server, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0029], lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Paul to include detected mail notification processing as taught by He in order to handle efficiently the detected mails by one designated server for further required process.

Regarding claim 2, Paul discloses the detection condition data includes a plurality of the letter strings (data categories, letter strings, are listed in the exclusion list, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 2-11, Figure 3).

Regarding claim 3, Paul discloses the list display means for displaying a list of information for identifying a plurality of mail received by the mail receiving means, respectively, in the list displaying, the list display means (user interface, 208 in Figure 2) displays information for identifying the mail extracted (first display code indicating the JUNK status of the message, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 46-49) by the detection means in a mode different that of mail not extracted (second display code indicating the OK status of the message, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 54-56) by the detection means (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 26-58, Figure 2).

Regarding claim 4, Paul discloses the category information inputted by a user to the detection conditions distribution server (exclusion list manager, 202 in Figure 2)(user exclusion list is created and modified manually by the user and exclusion list manager creates and stores a user exclusion list, see, e.g., col. 5 line 63 to col. 6 line16).

Art Unit: 2154

Regarding claim 5, Paul discloses the detection condition selection control means for storing selection information (exclusion list manager stores the user exclusion list, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 63-67).

Regarding claims 6-8, Paul discloses as follows:

Detected mail (JUNK status of the message) deletion means for deleting the mail received by the mail receiving means (the JUNK status of the message are automatically discarded by the filter (email filter, 204 in Figure 2), see, e.g., col. 6, line 64 to col. 7, line 1);

Detected mail selection deletion means for providing a display for prompting a user to select whether or not to delete the extracted (display the message filtered out in a distinctive color in the user's in-box in order to decide whether or not to delete the message, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-8); and

First and second detected mail processing control means for storing information regarding whether the extracted mail is deleted with a display for prompting or without it based on an input by an administrator to the mobile communication terminal (displays the alternatives in user's inbox, see, e.g., col. 6, line 64 to col. 7, line 8).

Regarding claim 9, Paul discloses all the limitations as above.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Paul discloses first detection conditions application control means for storing and acquiring detection condition application information, which regards whether is indispensable or being able to be selected by a user (email message marked with the first display code (JUNK mail) are further processed by the filter using user preference data entered by the user, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 16-36).

Art Unit: 2154

Regarding claim 13, Paul discloses as follows:

A detection conditions distribution server (control center, see, e.g., reference character 101 in Figure 1, col. 5, lines 54-56) for controlling detection condition data including a letter string for extracting specific mail received by a mobile communication terminal (a spam probe, an email address which is a letter string, created by processor to identify sources of unsolicited email or spam, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 19-24), comprising second detected mail processing control means for storing information regarding distribution processing for specifying that each of a plurality of mobile communication terminals automatically deletes mail or that a user is allowed to select the deletion, when the mail received by each of the plurality of mobile communication terminals which acquires the detection condition data satisfy the condition in which the mail include letter strings conforming to the letter string included in the detection condition data (display the message filtered out in a distinctive color in the user's in-box in order to decide whether or not to delete the message, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-8), based on specification by an administrator of each of the plurality of mobile communication terminals such that each piece of the information is associated with the information for identifying each of the mobile communication terminals (displays the alternatives in user's inbox, see, e.g., col. 6, line 64 to col. 7, line 8).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the



Art Unit: 2154

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over He (Pub. No. US 2003/0182383 A1) in view of Kitaura et al. (hereinafter Kitaura)(Pub. No. US 2002/0091569 A1).

Regarding claim 14, He discloses as follows:

A detected mail notification receiving server (notification receiver, 11 in figure 1 and email server in figure 5, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0040], lines 1-6), comprising;

Detected mail receiving means (notification means, 7 in figure 1, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0032], lines 11-16) for receiving information regarding mail including a first letter string conforming to a second letter string for detecting specific mail (message passes the criteria set by the user, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0031], lines 9-13) which is sent by a mobile communication terminal (email enabled machine, 2 in figure 1, is interpreted as any email enabled mobile machines); and

It is inherent that notification receiving server (email server) is connected to networks.

He does not disclose communication charge return instruction means.

Kitaura discloses as follows:

The coupon service server calculates the amount to be rebated to the user based on the sales slip data stored in the usage information database (see, e.g., page 12, paragraph [0175], lines 1-3);

This rebate could be refunded as a reduction of the monthly cellular phone communication charges wherein the communication charges including all services



Art Unit: 2154

provided such as emailing, texting, Internet browsing and calling (see, e.g., page 12, paragraph [0175], lines 4-5); and

The coupon service server generates discount statements (interpreted as the communication charge return instruction) and sends to the billing and payment processor (functioning as the billing control server 158 in figure 12) to generate bill statements (see, e.g., page 12, paragraph [0175], lines 7-12 and 17-18).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify He to include communication charge return instruction as taught by Kitaura in order to improve customer's satisfaction by the refund of communication charges for the unwanted emails distribution.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/19/2007, with respect to claims 1-11 and 13-14, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### **A. Summary of Applicant's Arguments**

In the remarks, the applicant argues as followings:

1) Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 12, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Paul in view of Satoh. In response to this rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references. Amended independent Claim 1 relates to a mobile communications terminal that is configured to filter out and delete unwanted e-mail messages using detection data retrieved from an external server;

2) In addressing this claimed "detected mail notification processing means" feature, the Official Action cites col. 7, lines 1-8 of Paul, and states that the reference describes that "all detected mails are stored at a special folder in the user's in-box." The Official Action then admits that Paul "does not disclose for sending the detected mail information to the detected mail notification receiving server from a mobile communication terminal for the communication charge purpose." In an attempt to remedy this deficiency, the Official Action relies on Satoh and asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to arrive at Applicant's claims. Applicants, however, respectfully traverse this rejection, as Satoh fails to teach or suggest the claimed features for which the reference is asserted under 35 U.S.C. § 103;

3) Claim 14 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Paul in view of Satoh. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as Claim 14 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references; and

4) Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Paul. In response to this rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 13 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied reference. Paul, however, fails to teach or suggest that the messages are filtered based on specification by an administrator of each of the plurality of mobile communication terminals such that each piece of the information is associated with the information for identifying each of the mobile communication terminals, as recited in independent Claim 13. In contrast, as discussed above, Paul describes that the same alerts are broadcast

Art Unit: 2154

to a plurality of system components, and the alerts are used to perform a system-wide filtering of all e-mail from a similar source. The server of Claim 13 allows for the administration of detection data by an administrator on a terminal-by-terminal basis such that each piece of the information is associated with the information for identifying each of the mobile communication terminals. Paul fails to teach or suggest this claimed feature.

#### B. Response to Arguments

In response to argument 1), applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The amended claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul et al. (hereinafter Paul)(U.S. Patent No. 6,052,709) in view of He (Pub. No. US 2003/0182383 A1).

In response to argument 2), the amended claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul et al. (hereinafter Paul)(U.S. Patent No. 6,052,709) in view of He (Pub. No. US 2003/0182383 A1).

He discloses as follows:

Detected mail notification processing (a web-server based email message filter and notification system) means for sending information (message passes the criteria set by the user, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0031], lines 9-13) that the mail has been extracted by the detection means (email detection means, 6 in figure 1) to a detected mail notification receiving server (notification receiver, 11 in figure 1 and email server in figure 5, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0040], lines 1-6)(a web-server based email

Art Unit: 2154

message filter and notification system sends a notification data signal to the email server, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0029], lines 1-6).

In response to argument 3), applicant's arguments with respect to claim 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over He (Pub. No. US 2003/0182383 A1) in view of Kitaura et al. (hereinafter Kitaura)(Pub. No. US 2002/0091569 A1) with the reason explained above.

In response to argument 4), regarding claim 13, Paul discloses as follows:

A detection conditions distribution server (control center, see, e.g., reference character 101 in Figure 1, col. 5, lines 54-56) for controlling detection condition data including a letter string for extracting specific mail received by a mobile communication terminal (a spam probe, an email address which is a letter string, created by processor to identify sources of unsolicited email or spam, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 19-24), comprising second detected mail processing control means for storing information regarding distribution processing for specifying that each of a plurality of mobile communication terminals automatically deletes mail or that a user is allowed to select the deletion, when the mail received by each of the plurality of mobile communication terminals which acquires the detection condition data satisfy the condition in which the mail include letter strings conforming to the letter string included in the detection condition data (display the message filtered out in a distinctive color in the user's in-box in order to decide whether or not to delete the message, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-8), based on specification by an administrator of each of the plurality of mobile

Art Unit: 2154

communication terminals such that each piece of the information is associated with the information for identifying each of the mobile communication terminals (displays the alternatives in user's inbox, see, e.g., col. 6, line 64 to col. 7, line 8).

Paul also discloses that the message are filtered based on specification by an administrator of each of the plurality of mobile communication terminals (the exclusion list processor, 502 in figure 5, maintains a separate user exclusion list for each user terminal, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 27-32 and email addressed to each user terminal is separately filtered using the exclusion list stored for each user respectively, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 49-54).

### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeong S. Park whose telephone number is 571-270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2154

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JP

May 31, 2007

  
NATHAN J. FLYNN  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100